arXiv:1209.5574v1 [quant-ph] 25 Sep 2012

Super-activation for Gaussian channels requires squeezing

Daniel Lercher[1,*], Géza Giedke[1,2,†], and Michael M. Wolf[1,‡]
[1]*Department of Mathematics, Technische Universität München, 85748 Garching, Germany*
[2]*Max-Planck-Institut für Quantenoptik, 85748 Garching, Germany*

(Dated: September 26, 2012)

The quantum capacity of bosonic Gaussian quantum channels can be non-additive in a particularly striking way: a pair of such optical-fiber type channels can individually have zero quantum capacity but super-activate each other such that the combined channel has strictly positive capacity. This has been shown in [Nature Photonics 5, 624 (2011)] where it was conjectured that squeezing is a necessary resource for this phenomenon. We provide a proof of this conjecture by showing that for gauge covariant channels a Choi matrix with positive partial transpose implies that the channel is entanglement-breaking. In addition, we construct an example which shows that this implication fails to hold for Gaussian channels which arise from passive interactions with a squeezed environment.

INTRODUCTION

A question at the heart of information theory—classical as well as quantum—is, how much information can be transmitted reliably through a given noisy channel. For classical memoryless channels Shannon posed and answered this questions in his groundbreaking work [1] in which he provided a tractable formula for the *capacity* of any such channel. In quantum information theory, despite considerable progress, no closed general expression is known for the classical or quantum capacity. What complicates matters in the quantum world is that quantum correlations between different channel uses can improve the performance or, mathematically speaking, lead to non-additivity effects. One of the most striking of these is *super-activation* of the quantum capacity: a pair of channels can individually have zero quantum capacity, but when combined give rise to a channel whose quantum capacity is strictly positive [2]. In [3] it was shown that this effect can occur for Gaussian channels. These describe evolutions of the continuous degrees of freedom of light in free space and in optical fibers as well as the time evolution of quantum memories which are based on collective excitations [4]. One of the channels used in the construction in [3] can indeed be regarded as a simple model of a single-mode optical fiber. The second channel, however, involves a high degree of squeezing within the interaction between a two-mode system and its environment—something considerably more difficult to realize. The authors of [3] write: "*Although an example using only linear optical elements would be desirable, we suspect, but cannot prove, that none exist.*" The present paper aims at settling this conjecture in the affirmative.

Currently, there is basically one approach towards super-activation. This is based on the fact that there are only two classes of channels known, which have provably zero quantum capacity: channels with a symmetric extension and so-called PPT channels. Since both classes are closed with respect to parallel composition, the only combination with a chance of successful super-activation is to take one channel from each class. In this work we show that if we restrict ourselves to passive Gaussian channels (i.e., those not involving squeezing), then the set of PPT channels becomes a strict subset of the set of channels with a symmetric extension, therefore rendering super-activation impossible.

PREREQUISITES

We begin with recalling basic notions and results needed for our purpose.

Gaussian states and channels: We consider a continuous variable system of n bosonic modes whose description involves n pairs of generalized position and momentum operators Q_k, P_k which may correspond to the quadratures of electromagnetic field modes. With the definition $R := (Q_1, P_1, \ldots, Q_n, P_n)$ the canonical commutation relations read

$$[R_k, R_l] = i\,(\sigma_n)_{kl}\,\mathbb{1}, \quad \text{with } \sigma_n := \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \begin{pmatrix} & 1 \\ -1 & \end{pmatrix} \tag{1}$$

being the symplectic form.
We associate with every density operator ρ its displacement vector d, with $d_k := \mathrm{tr}\,[\rho R_k]$ and its covariance matrix Γ with $\Gamma_{kl} := \mathrm{tr}\,[\rho\{R_k - d_k\mathbb{1}, R_l - d_l\mathbb{1}\}_+]$, $k, l = 1, \ldots, 2n$. d and Γ contain the first and second moments of the corresponding phase space distribution.
A Gaussian state is defined as a quantum state with a Gaussian Wigner phase space distribution function, see [5]. In particular it is completely specified by d and Γ, the latter being any real symmetric matrix that satisfies

---

[*] Electronic address: daniel.lercher@ma.tum.de
[†] Electronic address: giedke@mpq.mpg.de
[‡] Electronic address: m.wolf@tum.de

the uncertainty relation

$$\Gamma \geq i\sigma_n. \tag{2}$$

In the following all states are assumed to be centered (i.e. $d = 0$) since displacements in phase space are local unitaries in Hilbert space which are irrelevant for our purpose.

A completely positive trace-preserving map which preserves the Gaussian nature of states is called *Gaussian channel*, see [6]. Again neglecting its effect on d it can be characterized by its action on covariance matrices, which is given by

$$\Gamma \mapsto X\Gamma X^T + Y, \qquad X, Y = Y^T \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}(\mathbb{R}). \tag{3}$$

For a pair of real matrices X and $Y = Y^T$ to describe a bona fide Gaussian channel it is necessary and sufficient that

$$Y + i\left(\sigma_n - X\sigma_n X^T\right) \geq 0. \tag{4}$$

Unitary Gaussian evolutions then correspond to $Y = 0$ and X being real symplectic, i.e. $X \in Sp(2n, \mathbb{R}) = \{S \in \mathcal{M}_{2n}(\mathbb{R}) |\, S\sigma_n S^T = \sigma_n\}$. Every Gaussian channel can be realized by a unitary dilation [7], invoking $n_E \leq 2n$ environmental modes. This means that there exist a unitary U representing S on Hilbert space and a Gaussian state ρ_E such that density matrices evolve as

$$\rho \mapsto \mathrm{tr}_E\left[U(\rho_E \otimes \rho)U^\dagger\right]. \tag{5}$$

On the level of covariance matrices Γ_E and Γ the overall evolution then looks like

$$(\Gamma_E \oplus \Gamma) \mapsto S\left(\Gamma_E \oplus \Gamma\right)S^T. \tag{6}$$

In the notation $S = \begin{pmatrix} S_1 & S_2 \\ S_3 & S_4 \end{pmatrix}$ that reflects the decomposition of the total system into the environment and the n-modes system, one finds $X = S_4$ and $Y = S_3\Gamma_E S_3^T$.

The Symplectic Orthogonal Group: A special case of a unitary Gaussian evolutions is the one generated by a passive Hamiltonian

$$H = \sum_{k,l=1}^{N} h_{kl} a_k^\dagger a_l + h.c., \; h_{kl} \in \mathbb{C}, \tag{7}$$

with annihilation operator $a_k := (Q_k + iP_k)/\sqrt{2}$. Passive Hamiltonians comprise the set of quadratic Hamiltonians, which commute with the total particle number operator.

A unitary Gaussian evolution generated by a passive Hamiltonian as in (7) corresponds to a symplectic orthogonal matrix $S \in K(m) := Sp(2m, \mathbb{R}) \cap O(2m, \mathbb{R})$. Mathematically, $K(m)$ is the largest compact subgroup of the real symplectic group. Physically, it corresponds to the set of operations which can be implemented using beam splitters and phase shifters only [8].

$K(m)$ is isomorphic to $U(m)$ [9]. This can be verified easily: First one observes that elements $R \in \mathcal{M}_{2m}(\mathbb{R})$ in the commutant of σ_m have the form

$$\begin{aligned} [\sigma_m, R] \;&=\; 0 \Leftrightarrow R = (r_{ij})_{i,j=1}^m, \\ r_{ij} &= \begin{pmatrix} a_{ij} & b_{ij} \\ -b_{ij} & a_{ij} \end{pmatrix}, \; a_{ij}, b_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}. \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

With this result one verifies that the map

$$\begin{aligned} &\Lambda : U(m) \to K(m) \\ &(c_{ij}) \mapsto (C_{ij}), \quad C_{ij} = \begin{pmatrix} \Re(c_{ij}) & \Im(c_{ij}) \\ -\Im(c_{ij}) & \Re(c_{ij}) \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

is indeed a group isomorphism.

At this point we add two observations that will help us later to exploit the particular structure of real symplectic orthogonals (9). The set

$$\mathcal{C}_n := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ -B & A \end{pmatrix} \middle|\, \begin{matrix} A, B \in \\ \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{R}) \end{matrix} \right\} \tag{10}$$

together with the operation of matrix multiplication forms a semigroup with neutral element. As such, it is isomorphic to $\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$. An isomorphism is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ -B & A \end{pmatrix} \mapsto A + iB\,. \tag{11}$$

And finally, for complex square matrices $A, B \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ one finds the following criterion for positive-semidefiniteness [10]

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ -B & A \end{pmatrix} \geq 0 \Leftrightarrow A \pm iB \geq 0\,. \tag{12}$$

Properties of Gaussian Channels: We call a quantum channel T PPT (for "positive partial transpose") if $\theta \circ T$ is completely positive, where θ denotes time reversal, which in Schrödinger representation corresponds to transposition. A Gaussian channel characterized by (X, Y) is PPT iff [11]

$$Y - i\left(\sigma_n + X\sigma_n X^T\right) \geq 0. \tag{13}$$

A Gaussian channel is entanglement-breaking if and only if Y admits a decomposition into real matrices M and N such that [12]

$$Y = M + N, \quad M \geq i\sigma_n, \quad N \geq iX\sigma_n X^T. \tag{14}$$

This reflects the fact that any entanglement-breaking quantum channel consists of a measurement, followed by a state preparation depending on the outcome of the measurement [13, 14]. As a consequence, every entanglement-breaking channel has a symmetric extension.

Definition 1. *In accordance with [15] we call a Gaussian channel characterized by* (X, Y) *"gauge covariant", if* $[X, \sigma_n] = [Y, \sigma_n] = 0$.

Definition 2. *We call a Gaussian channel "passive" if it can be generated by a passive Hamiltonian* H *(7) that couples the system to an environment in a Gibbs state* ρ_E *of a passive Hamiltonian* H'*:*

$$\rho_E = \frac{\mathrm{e}^{-\beta H'}}{\mathrm{tr}\left[\mathrm{e}^{-\beta H'}\right]}, \quad H' = \sum_{k,l=1}^{n_E} h'_{kl} a_k^\dagger a_l + h.c. \quad (15)$$

One can show that, as a consequence of the normal mode decomposition of Gaussian states, (15) is equivalent to $[\Gamma_E, \sigma_{n_E}] = 0$, where Γ_E is the covariance matrix of the Gaussian state ρ_E and σ_{n_E} is the corresponding symplectic form. This implies for passive Gaussian channels

$$[Y, \sigma_n] = \left[S_3 \Gamma_E S_3^T, \sigma_n\right] = 0, \quad (16)$$

as one derives from the block structure of S_3 (9) and the analogous structure of the elements in the commutant of σ_n (8). Similarly we find $[X, \sigma_n] = [S_4, \sigma_n] = 0$. Hence, every passive Gaussian channel is gauge covariant.

MAIN RESULT

Proposition 3. *A gauge covariant Gaussian channel is entanglement-breaking iff it is PPT.*

Proof. Evidently, entanglement-breaking implies PPT, so we have to prove the reverse implication. To this end it is convenient to reorder the canonical coordinates as $(Q_1, \ldots, Q_N, P_1, \ldots, P_N)$. In this notation

$$\sigma_m = \begin{pmatrix} & \mathbb{1}_m \\ -\mathbb{1}_m & \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } Y = \begin{pmatrix} Y_1 & Y_2 \\ -Y_2 & Y_1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The latter follows from (16) together with (8).
We prove first that we can restrict ourselves to the case $X = \hat{X} \oplus \hat{X}$, where by virtue of the symplectic singular value decomposition [16] the matrix $\hat{X}$ is diagonal and non-negative. Assume, this is not the case. Then we can replace the passive evolution U, which describes the interaction between system and environment, by $U' = (\mathbb{1}_E \otimes U_G) U (\mathbb{1}_E \otimes U_F)$. U_F and U_G are passive unitary evolutions that act only on the system. They correspond to symplectic transformations $F, G \in K(n)$ in phase space. We denote the resulting channel by T'. T is PPT iff T' is PPT. The same holds for the entanglement-breaking property. We find

$$\begin{aligned} X' &= GXF & (17) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} G_1 & G_2 \\ -G_2 & G_1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} X_1 & X_2 \\ -X_2 & X_1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} F_1 & F_2 \\ -F_2 & F_1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ & \quad \text{with } F_1 + iF_2, G_1 + iG_2 \in U(n). \end{aligned}$$

Now we can exploit the isomorphism (11) and choose $F_{1,2}$ and $G_{1,2}$ such that $(G_1 + iG_2)(X_1 + iX_2)(F_1 + iF_2) =: \hat{X}$ is the singular value decomposition of $X_1 + iX_2$. Hence, $X' = \hat{X} \oplus \hat{X}$ with $\hat{X}$ diagonal and non-negative.

We will now exploit criterion (14) by showing that the decomposition of Y into $M := Y - X^2$ and $N := X^2$ obeys the required conditions, which read:

$$\begin{aligned} N - iX\sigma X^T &= X(\mathbb{1} - i\sigma)X^T \geq 0, & (18) \\ M - i\sigma &= \begin{pmatrix} Y_1 - \hat{X}^2 & Y_2 - i\mathbb{1} \\ -Y_2 + i\mathbb{1} & Y_1 - \hat{X}^2 \end{pmatrix} \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality in (18) follows simply from $(\mathbb{1} - i\sigma) \geq 0$. In order to arrive at the second inequality we use (12) and rewrite the inequality as

$$\begin{array}{c} Y_1 - \hat{X}^2 \pm i(Y_2 - i\mathbb{1}) \geq 0 \;\Leftrightarrow \\ Y_1 \pm iY_2 - (\hat{X}^2 \mp \mathbb{1}) \geq 0 \;\Leftrightarrow \\ Y_1 \pm iY_2 - (\hat{X}^2 + \mathbb{1}) \geq 0 \;\Leftrightarrow \\ \left\{ \begin{array}{l} Y_1 + iY_2 + (\hat{X}^2 + \mathbb{1}) \geq 0 \\ Y_1 - iY_2 - (\hat{X}^2 + \mathbb{1}) \geq 0 \end{array} \right. \Leftrightarrow \\ Y_1 \pm i\left(Y_2 - i(\mathbb{1} + \hat{X}^2)\right) \geq 0 \quad . \end{array} \quad (19)$$

Here we used two elementary facts: (i) a matrix is positive iff its complex conjugate is positive, and (ii) the sum of two positive matrices is again positive. In the last line, with (12), we recover the PPT criterion (13)

$$\begin{aligned} & Y - i(\sigma + X\sigma X^T) = Y - i\sigma(\mathbb{1} + X^2) = \\ & = \begin{pmatrix} Y_1 & Y_2 - i(\mathbb{1} + \hat{X}^2) \\ -Y_2 + i(\mathbb{1} + \hat{X}^2) & Y_1 \end{pmatrix} \geq 0\,, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof. ☐

Proposition 4 (No super-activation without squeezing)**.** *Let* T_1, T_2 *be passive Gaussian quantum channels. If each channel either has a symmetric extension or satisfies the PPT property, then* $Q\left(T_1 \otimes T_2\right) = 0$.

Proof. Let $T_i\ (i = 1 \text{ or } 2)$ be PPT. T_i is gauge covariant, because it is passive, and according to Prop. 3 it is thus entanglement-breaking. In particular, it has a symmetric extension, which then also holds for $T_1 \otimes T_2$. Hence, the combined channel has zero quantum capacity. ☐

PASSIVE INTERACTIONS WITH A SQUEEZED ENVIRONMENT

We now consider an example of a Gaussian channel T for $n = n_E = 2$. T is generated by a passive interaction, as in (7), but the environment is assumed to be in a mixed squeezed state ρ_E (i.e. $\det \Gamma_E \neq 1$, $\Gamma_E \geq i\sigma_2$ and $\Gamma_E \not\geq \mathbb{1}_4$). T will be shown to be PPT but not entanglement-breaking. We omit the index of $\mathbb{1}_2$ and choose

$$\Gamma_E = \tfrac{3+\sqrt{13}}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 5 & & 3 & \\ & 5 & & -3 \\ 3 & & 2 & \\ & -3 & & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{20}$$

$$S = \sqrt{\tfrac{1}{3}}\left(\begin{array}{cc|cc} -\sqrt{2}\mathbb{1} & & \mathbb{1} & \\ & -\mathbb{1} & & \sqrt{2}\mathbb{1} \\ \hline \mathbb{1} & & \sqrt{2}\mathbb{1} & \\ & \sqrt{2}\mathbb{1} & & \mathbb{1} \end{array}\right). \tag{21}$$

S represents two beamsplitters: one of transmittivity $\frac{2}{3}$ that couples the first system mode to the first mode of the environment and a second of transmittivity $\frac{1}{3}$ that acts between the two remaining modes. The corresponding (X, Y), which characterize the Gaussian channel, then read

$$X = \sqrt{\tfrac{1}{3}}\begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\mathbb{1} & \\ & \mathbb{1} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{22}$$

$$Y = \tfrac{3+\sqrt{13}}{6}\begin{pmatrix} 5 & & 3\sqrt{2} & \\ & 5 & & -3\sqrt{2} \\ 3\sqrt{2} & & 4 & \\ & -3\sqrt{2} & & 4 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{23}$$

Proposition 5. *The Gaussian channel determined by* (22) *exhibits the PPT property but it is not entanglement-breaking.*

Proof. Equations (4) and (13) are satisfied as one verifies explicitly.
It remains to show that T is not entanglement-breaking. With the inequalities (14) in mind we observe that this is equivalent to

$$\max_{(\lambda,M)\in\mathcal{D}} \lambda < 1, \quad \text{where} \tag{24}$$

$$\mathcal{D} \;=\; \left\{ \begin{array}{c} (\lambda, M) \in \\ \mathbb{R}\times\mathcal{M}_4(\mathbb{R}) \end{array} \middle| \begin{array}{rl} M & = M^T, \\ M & \geq \lambda i\sigma, \\ Y - M & \geq \lambda iX\sigma X^T \end{array} \right\}.$$

This is a semi-definite program [17], so that the corresponding dual program can be used to construct a witness which certifies (24). Its specific form is given in the appendix. ☐

DISCUSSION

Squeezing is a useful resource in many contexts, such as entanglement generation, metrology, information coding or cryptography. When restricted to the practically relevant Gaussian regime, we know that it is sometimes even a necessary resource. This is the fact for entanglement generation [18] and, as we have proven in this work, as well for super-activation of the quantum capacity. In the latter case, however, the proof of necessity relies on the framework—the basic idea behind the construction of all currently known instances of super-activation. In order to make a stronger statement, we would need to know whether there are other types of channels with zero quantum capacity [19].

Another question, which suggests itself, is how much squeezing is necessary within the given framework. Unfortunately, we do at the moment not see an approach towards settling this quantitative question.

Acknowledgements: We acknowledge financial support from the European project COQUIT, the CHIST-ERA/BMBF project CQC and the QCCC programme of the Elite Network of Bavaria.

APPENDIX

In the following we show how to certify (24). Note that with the notation $\tilde{Y} = 0_4 \oplus Y$, $\tilde{X} = i\sigma \oplus iX\sigma X^T$, $\tilde{M} = M \oplus -M$, the two inequalities in the definition of $\mathcal{D}$ can be rewritten as

$$\lambda\tilde{X} + \tilde{Y} + \tilde{M} \geq 0. \tag{25}$$

In the following we confirm (24) by showing that for all $(\lambda, M) \in \mathcal{D}$, $\lambda \leq 0.94$. For this purpose, let us define the witness matrix Ω,

$$\Omega = (A + iB) \oplus (A + iC). \tag{26}$$

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & & -a_3 & \\ & a_1 & & a_3 \\ -a_3 & & a_2 & \\ & a_3 & & a_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad a = \begin{pmatrix} 0.512 \\ 0.722 \\ 0.592 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} & b_1 & & b_3 \\ -b_1 & & b_3 & \\ & -b_3 & & b_2 \\ -b_3 & & -b_2 & \end{pmatrix}, \quad b = \begin{pmatrix} -0.212 \\ 0.552 \\ -0.368 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} & c_1 & & c_3 \\ -c_1 & & c_3 & \\ & -c_3 & & c_2 \\ -c_3 & & -c_2 & \end{pmatrix}, \quad c = \begin{pmatrix} 0.39 \\ -0.3 \\ 0.368 \end{pmatrix}.$$

and state some of its properties:

(i) Ω is positive definite.

(ii) $\forall(\lambda, M) \in \mathcal{D}:\ \mathrm{tr}\left[\Omega\tilde{M}\right] = i\mathrm{tr}\left[(B - C)M\right] = 0$, since $(B - C)$ is anti-symmetric and M is symmetric.

(iii) $\mathrm{tr}\left[\Omega\tilde{X}\right] = 2(b_1 + b_2 + \frac{2}{3}c_1 + \frac{1}{3}c_2) = 1$

(iv) $\mathrm{tr}\left[\Omega\tilde{Y}\right] = \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{13}}{3}\right)\left(5a_1 + 4a_2 - 6\sqrt{2}a_3\right) < 0.94$

Let now be $(\lambda, M) \in \mathcal{D}$. Applying (ii) and (iii) in the first line and (i) together with (25) in the third line leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda - \mathrm{tr}\left[\Omega\tilde{Y}\right] &= -\lambda\mathrm{tr}\left[\Omega\tilde{X}\right] - \mathrm{tr}\left[\Omega\tilde{Y}\right] - \mathrm{tr}\left[\Omega\tilde{M}\right] \\ &= -\mathrm{tr}\left[\Omega\left(\lambda\tilde{X} + \tilde{Y} + \tilde{M}\right)\right] \qquad (27) \\ &\leq 0. \end{aligned}$$

With (iv) we obtain $\lambda < 0.94$.

[1] C. E. Shannon. A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Tech. J.*, 27:379–423,623–656, 1948.

[2] G. Smith, J. A. Smolin, and J. Yard. Quantum communication with zero-capacity channels. *Science*, 321:1812–1815, 2008. 1102.4580v1 [quant-ph].

[3] G. Smith, J. A. Smolin, and J. Yard. Quantum communication with gaussian channels of zero quantum capacity. *Nature Photonics*, 5:624–627, 2011. 0807.4935 [quant-ph].

[4] K. Hammerer, A.S. Sørensen, and E.S. Polzik. Quantum interface between light and atomic ensembles. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 82:10411093, 2010.

[5] A. S. Holevo. *Probabilistic and statistical aspects of quantum theory*, chapter on Gaussian states, pages 187–218. Edizioni della Normale, 2011.

[6] J. Eisert and M. M. Wolf. *Quantum information with continous variables of atoms and light*, chapter on Gaussian quantum channels, pages 23–42. Imperial College Press, 2007. quant-ph/0505151.

[7] F. Caruso, J. Eisert, V. Giovannetti, and A. S. Holevo. Multi-mode bosonic gaussian channels. *New Journal of Physics*, 10(083030), 2008. 0804.0511v3 [quant-ph].

[8] M. Reck and A. Zeilinger. Experimental realization of any discrete unitary operator. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 73:58–61, 1994.

[9] Arvind, B. Dutta, N. Mukunda, and R. Simon. The real symplectic groups in quantum mechanics and optics. *Pramana*, 45:471, 1995. quant-ph/9509002v3.

[10] This equivalence can be seen from the similarity transformation $\begin{pmatrix} A - iB & \\ & A + iB \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1} & i\mathbb{1} \\ i\mathbb{1} & \mathbb{1} \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ -B & A \end{pmatrix}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{1} & -i\mathbb{1} \\ -i\mathbb{1} & \mathbb{1} \end{pmatrix}$.

[11] In phase space, θ corresponds to the transformation $\Gamma \mapsto \tilde{\theta}\Gamma\tilde{\theta}^T$ with $\tilde{\theta} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{n} \mathrm{diag}(1, -1)$.

[12] A. S. Holevo. Entanglement-breaking channels in infinite dimensions. *Problems of Information Transmission*, 44:171–184, 2008. 0802.0235v1 [quant-ph].

[13] M. Horodecki, P. W. Shor, and M. B. Ruskai. General entanglement breaking channels. *Rev. Math. Phys*, 15:629–641, 2003. quant-ph/0302031.

[14] A. S. Holevo, M. E. Shirokov, and R. F. Werner. Separability and entanglement-breaking in infinite dimensions. *Russian Math. Surveys*, 60(N2), 2005. quant-ph/0504204.

[15] A. S. Holevo. *Mathematical horizons for quantum physics*, chapter 5: Two mathematical problems in quantum information theory, pages 109–131. World Scientific, 2010.

[16] M. M. Wolf. Not-so-normal mode decomposition. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 100(070505), 2008. 0707.0604 [quant-ph].

[17] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. *Convex optimization*, chapter 4.6 and 5.9, pages 167–169, 265–266. Cambridge University Press, 2011.

[18] M. M. Wolf, J. Eisert, and M. B. Plenio. The entangling power of passive optical elements. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 90(047904), 2003. quant-ph/0206171.

[19] G. Smith and J.A. Smolin. Detecting incapacity of a quantum channel. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 108(230507), 2012. quant-ph/0206171.